Government of Canada Gouvernement du Canada

Canada

CANADIAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
www.chrc-ccdp.ca

Resources

News Room

Speeches

2008 | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 | 2004 | 2003

29/09/2003

Leadership Symposium (A Contribution to Danish Top Leader Development) Statement by the CHRC Chief Commissioner.

Statement by Mrs. Mary Gusella, Chief Commissioner Canadian Human Rights Commission
- For the -
Leadership Symposium (A Contribution to Danish Top Leader Development)
September 25-29, 2003,
Donald Gordon Centre, Queen's University
Kingston, Ontario

"Getting the best out of diversity in organizations, business and communities. The Canadian experience with multiculturalism"

I) Introduction

I am pleased to be here at today's symposium to exchange experiences on governance with colleagues from Denmark. I understand Denmark and Canada share many common traits: strong economies, high standards of living, well-established democracies, an educated population with a strong sense of national identity.

The extent of our similarities - particularly the fact that both Canadians and Danes feel a strong sense of national identity - might be surprising if one were to look only at the ethno-cultural makeup of our respective countries. Canada has been dubbed "the global village in one country". When compared with Denmark and, in fact, with all other countries, Canada can be seen as the most multicultural society in the world.

Let me provide a few compelling facts. Today, immigration has outpaced the natural birth rate. It accounts for over half of Canada's population growth. In 2001, nearly one in every five people living in Canada was born outside the country. Almost 4 million Canadians self-identify as visible minorities. They have more than 200 ethnic origins. Projections show that by 2016, visible minorities will make up one-fifth of Canada.

The aboriginal population jumped 22% in the five years between 1996 and 2001, making Canada the country with the second largest aboriginal population, behind New Zealand.

In sum, the rate of growth of Canada's ethno-cultural diversity is more rapid than at any point in our country's history.

At the same time, the sense of a national Canadian identity is strong. One might think that in an ethnically and regionally diverse country such as Canada, people might define themselves by their country of origin, language, religion or region (given that Canada stretches across five time zones). In fact they do, but a 2002 study on the nature of Canadian identity at the beginning of the 21st century also showed that Canadians have become more attached to their country over the past two decades, more likely to describe themselves as "Canadian first" and less likely to feel a primary identification with their distinct local communities.

The existence of a strong sense of Canadian identity in a country with such diversity might seem counterintuitive. If unity in diversity presents a challenge, it is because the opposite, unity in uniformity, may seem at first glance to be more desirable or easier to achieve. One might be tempted to assume that governance would be so much easier if all Canadians spoke a single language, had the same traditions and the same cultural references and lived under the same laws, without variations between communities, provinces or regions.

In fact, very early in Canada's history, this was the approach taken. Uniformity was the goal and assimilation was the means of achieving it. In 1839, Lord Durham recommended the assimilation of the French in Canada into the English-speaking population. Assimilationist policies aimed at Canada's aboriginal peoples date back to our earliest beginnings and continued until fairly recently – for instance, in the residential schools system. In other instances, isolation of a specific population, rather than assimilation, was the means chosen. The internment of Japanese- Canadian citizens during the Second World War is a case in point.

But I do not want to paint too bleak a picture of our early history. Assimilation and isolation were not the only hallmarks of Canada's early approach to minorities and aboriginal peoples. At the same time, the seeds of tolerance were being sown early on in our history. The flag of Montreal, which goes back 122 years, shows the French fleur-de-lis, the English rose, the Irish shamrock and the Scottish thistle. This was an early symbol of Canadians' desire to not only tolerate diversity but to foster inclusion.

The question for public policy makers of today is how we evolved from a society made up largely of two communities: an English-speaking society that felt identification with Britain and a traditional French Catholic community, into the diverse Canada we know today.

The fact is that the Canadian identity has undergone remarkable transformation in the past half century. The tense debate over the introduction of the Official Languages Act in the 1960s is now seen as a thing of the past, with four in five Canadians today in support of the minority language rights protections in the Charter. Across the country, most Canadians support the federal bilingualism policy.

The assimilationist and isolationist policies of Canada's early years have been replaced by a society where fully eighty-three percent believe that people from different racial and cultural groups enrich Canadian culture. The same 2002 study of Canadians' sense of national identity showed that, over the past two decades, strong support for bilingualism and multiculturalism has developed and has become a cornerstone of the Canadian identity across the country.

Somehow over the past few decades, we have managed to achieve, or to begin to achieve, social cohesion amidst diversity. The key question for public policy makers in Canada - and for those looking at Canada as a source of inspiration for governance in a diverse society – is how this evolution occurred. In Canada, the federal government's approach to diversity focuses on ensuring citizens can contribute fully to Canadian society and on maintaining "social cohesion" – the process of developing core shared principles without which a democratic society loses the capacity to govern itself. This is achieved through a wide variety of means: providing equality of opportunity, promoting participation in governance, and encouragement and support for the activities, institutions, and opportunities that foster expression, interaction and attachment.

But before looking at the governance structures we have put in place in Canada to foster diversity, I would like to sound a note of caution. When I say that an evolution has taken place, I do not mean to say that the evolution is complete. We are a remarkably diverse and tolerant society, but there are still challenges ahead. While diversity is clearly a hallmark of Canadian society that people are proud of, research also shows that Canadians believe that intolerance still exists within Canada. Indeed, more than half the population believes that discrimination against non-whites is a problem in Canada. Canada welcomes new immigrants and refugees every year, but many newcomers – particularly

visible minorities – experience high unemployment and underemployment in low-wage jobs that do not match their skills and formal credentials. Aboriginal peoples still suffer disproportionate levels of poverty, suicide and poor health when compared to the general Canadian population.

Women, ethnic minorities and particularly visible minorities are underrepresented in positions of formal political power in Canada.

In spite of these challenges, I do believe that we have been heading in the right direction over the past few decades. As our Governor-General said:

> " It is a strength and not a weakness that we are a permanently incomplete experiment. What we continue to create today began 450 years ago as a political project, when the French first met with the Aboriginal people. It is an old experiment, complex and, in worldly terms, largely successful."

II) The History of Multiculturalism in Canada

Let me start by tracing the institutional and legal framework we have put in place to foster diversity. The Canadian approach to multiculturalism has been a progressive one, developed one step at a time over a long period. In fact, it wasn't until the latter part of the 20th century that the institutional and legal framework that would lead to our present-day policy of multiculturalism was first introduced.

In 1969, the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism was created and it laid the foundation for what was to become our multiculturalism policy: the concept of "one people, two official languages, many cultures" bound together by tolerance and respectful of differences. Two years later, the world's first multiculturalism policy was adopted. In 1977, the Canadian Human Rights Act passed, and a year later the Canadian Human Rights Commission was created. In 1982, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms came into force. The equality provisions of the Charter came into effect three years later. A year after that, the Royal Commission on Equality in Employment was formed, with the first employment equity legislation appearing in 1986. In 1988 the Canadian Multiculturalism Act was adopted.

In just under twenty years, a complex web of legislation, policies and programmes was put in place. All of these legislative and institutional developments were based on the notion that respect for diversity, social justice and civic participation would foster social cohesion. The aim was a society where people from all backgrounds could feel a sense of belonging and attachment.

Over time, our approach to multiculturalism has evolved with the population – allowing us to define ourselves. In the early stages, we focused on bilingualism and biculturalism. Later we focused on discrimination and chose, in the Canadian Human Rights Act and in the provincial human rights codes and the Charter, to set out a broader list of prohibited grounds of discrimination based on historically disadvantaged groups which went beyond language and culture. In the employment equity regime, we focused on specific groups traditionally underrepresented in the labour market – women, aboriginal peoples, persons with disabilities and visible minorities.

Today, our approach to multiculturalism has evolved yet again. Diversity now refers to the many social and physical characteristics that we use to define ourselves. Diversity includes everyone. It is not only defined by race, language, ethnicity and religion, but has expanded to include cross-cutting characteristics such as gender, sexual orientation and range of ability and age. The same approaches that earlier helped Canadians develop into a bilingual, multicultural society are now also helping to break down barriers that prevent individuals from reaching their full potential. One could say that in the early days, our policies on multiculturalism, non-discrimination and employment equity focused on helping to bring the "other" – defined as the historically disadvantaged, the minority, or the marginalized - into the mainstream. Now, the mainstream has evolved and we expect it to continue to evolve. We now define diversity to include everyone and focus on the barriers that prevent inclusion. The principle therefore guiding our governance structures is "unity in diversity": the notion that diversity is a strength, rather than a problem to be rooted out or a threat to be eliminated.

As I said, a complex web of legislation, policies and programs has been put in place at the federal level. A range of

governance tools are used to promote multiculturalism and foster diversity. At the federal government level, the Multiculturalism Policy centers on three goals: civic participation, social justice and identity. The goal of civic participation aims at ensuring diverse communities have the capacity and opportunity to participate in public policy discussions and decision-making. The "social justice" pillar focuses on the need to build a society that ensures fair and equitable treatment; respects the dignity and accommodates the needs of Canadians regardless of their ethnic, cultural, linguistic, religious or racial origins. The Canadian Human Rights Commission is a key element of this social justice agenda. The third pillar of the Multiculturalism policy focuses on fostering a society that recognizes, respects and reflects the diversity of cultures so that citizens of all backgrounds feel a sense of belonging and attachment to Canada.

Let me give you some concrete examples of federal government programmes in place to work with community organizations and define issues facing them: the Multiculturalism program has worked with a group of foreign-trained doctors to develop and implement a strategy to gain recognition in Canada for their foreign credentials; it has worked with groups like the Filmmakers Association of Visible Minority and Ethnic Minorities to identify barriers to equitable access to the film industry; it supports activities, anti-racism education programs and cultural diversity training for police and health care professionals. These are but a few examples of the types of governance initiatives introduced at the federal level in Canada to promote multiculturalism. But I would like to focus on two specific instruments of governance we have used to foster diversity and multiculturalism.

As Chief Commissioner of the Canadian Human Rights Commission, I am responsible for employment equity and human rights within the federal sphere. That means all federal departments, agencies, boards and commissions, as well as Crown corporations and also those segments of the private sector which fall under federal jurisdiction such as banks, inter-provincial transportation, telecommunications, etc. I think it is fair to say that these two pieces of legislation are key elements of the Canadian approach to diversity. Other elements of our governance framework are, of course, important. I described a minute ago a range of federal multiculturalism initiatives: social programmes aimed at fostering inclusion, educational measures, policies and programmes to assist in the integration of immigrants and economic levers to foster participation in the economy. The two pieces of legislation I oversee are the watchdogs of the system. They measure, through a combination of audits, individual complaints and public studies – whether the system is indeed working.

III) Human Rights

Although preceded by the creation of Scandinavian ombudsmen by a few centuries, the Canadian Commission was one of the first National Human Rights Institutions in the world. As I said, our legislation has been in place for over twenty-five years. And, just as there has been an evolution in how we define multiculturalism, so too has there been a shift in discrimination in Canada since the law was first put in place.

Since 1977 when the Canadian Human Rights Act was adopted, the human rights landscape has changed considerably in a number of ways: although discrimination is still at the forefront of Canadians' human rights concerns, it has become more complex and more subtle.

- Human rights law and practice have evolved to recognize that inequality arises not only from prejudice but also from the discriminatory impacts of ordinary policies and practices.
- While individuals still experience discrimination and still deserve remedies, we also know now that we miss most of the picture if we focus solely on individuals - some types of discrimination only become apparent when we look at ongoing patterns of inequality for groups - in other words, systemic discrimination.
- Demographic changes in Canada, for instance a higher proportion of visible minorities, a burgeoning young aboriginal population and a general population which is aging, have also had an impact on the types of human rights issues coming to the fore and the demands placed on human rights institutions.

With the new human rights challenges we are facing, and in the absence of amendments to our legislation, over the past year, we have been engaged in a process of change at the Canadian Human Rights Commission. In order to make the Canadian Human Rights Commission a strong force for social cohesion it must be capable of addressing systemic human rights concerns and do so in a manner which is accessible to all sectors of society, and promotes healing, rather than division. A system that focuses mostly on a litigious approach to individual complaints can foster societal brittleness by creating "winners" and "losers". Especially in cases of systemic discrimination, an adversarial process

which focuses solely on individual remedies is even less effective.

That is why, over the past year, we have been focusing on mediation, prevention and alternatives to the formal complaint process, such as public inquiries and special studies. Our reforms are aimed at balancing the mix between mediated and traditionally-managed cases, addressing the backlog and liberating our energies and resources to focus more on systemic, egregious and high-impact human rights issues.

Changing a system which has grown over twenty-five years of accumulated jurisprudence, processes and client expectations is not without risks. But we have no choice if we intend to make the Human Rights Commission a stronger force for social cohesion.

IV) Employment Equity

In addition to monitoring whether discrimination is occurring at the federal level in the employment and the provision of services, the Canadian Human Rights Commission, as the federal watchdog, also has a mandate to ensure that broader employment systems fully reflect the diversity of Canada's population. Again, some evolution was needed in order to arrive at the system we have in place today.

In the 1970s, the government first tested the waters for employment equity through a voluntary program aimed at women in the private sector, which created awareness but brought about no tangible results. Ten years later, in 1983, the Government of Canada announced the establishment of the Royal Commission on Equality in Employment. Its terms of reference were to:

> "Explore the most efficient, effective and equitable means of promoting equality in employment for four groups: women, native people, disabled persons, and visible minorities".

The report used the term "employment equity" to distinguish the Canadian initiative from American affirmative action programs which had been associated with quotas. The recommendations led to the enactment of the first Employment Equity Act in 1986. Although discrimination was already prohibited under human rights statutes, there was a growing awareness that proactive steps were required to change systems and practices which had become entrenched in a traditionally white male dominated workplace.

In a nutshell, the purpose of the new Act was and still is to "achieve equality in the workplace so that no person shall be denied employment opportunities or benefits for reasons unrelated to ability and, in the fulfillment of that goal, to correct the conditions of disadvantage in employment experienced by women, Aboriginal peoples, persons with disabilities and members of visible minorities". In 1986, the law applied to federally-regulated private sector operating primarily in the banking, transportation and communications industries. It required employers to identify workplace barriers, develop and implement equity plans for the four designated groups and report annually to the responsible Minister on progress. There were no enforcement mechanisms in the Act, other than for failure to report. The intent was that employers would be encouraged to implement employment equity based on public scrutiny of the reports and knowledge that the data could be used to file systemic discrimination complaints under the Canadian Human Rights Act.

Five years later, in 1991, the Act was again reviewed. Parliament heard from many major stakeholders and recommended a stronger enforcement regime. That year, the Canadian Human Rights Commission was empowered to monitor and enforce the Act through on-site compliance reviews, and, where necessary, through an Employment Equity Review Tribunal with the power to issue binding orders.

This past year, the government undertook a third review of the Act. The main question for the Canadian Human Rights Commission was whether the legislation, with a compliance process that still relied heavily on cooperation and persuasion, was working. Both the Commission and the House of Commons Committee concluded that the Act was working, and that it was still necessary. Although designated groups had made some progress since the Act was enacted, they have still not reached full equality in the workplace. Results for women overall are particularly encouraging, although women who are part of the minority groups continue to have more difficulty. There has been progress for minority groups but it has been slower. Persons with disabilities continue to be the most disadvantaged and

will undoubtedly require a more concerted strategy if they are to make the progress they require to achieve fair representation.

V) The Economics of Multiculturalism

Ten years ago when I was Deputy Minister of Multiculturalism and Citizenship we had a programme to promote the economic advantages of multiculturalism for business. The slogan was "multi means business" and it helped businesses see the benefits of having a multicultural workforce and reaching out to multicultural markets.

This dynamic has become much better understood in recent years: as a recent headline in a major national newspaper, the Globe & Mail, last year said it starkly: "reducing the wage gap isn't just moral – it's good for business." Multiculturalism has been a social investment – which today is paying dividends, not only in social capital, but in our economic bottom line.

Managing diversity is an exercise in organizational flexibility: whether diversity leads to increased conflict or to a new synergy will depend on how the organization manages inclusion and difference. I will give you an example from Denmark: In a Danish navy deployment, crew effectiveness was measured across ships with all-male crews, all-female crews and mixed gender crews. The mixed gender crew was shown to be the most effective since it could draw from diverse perspectives. But, the mixed gender crew had the steepest learning curve. At the organizational level, studies have shown that diversity can make an organization or a group more flexible, better at problem-solving and enhance creativity - all very desirable characteristics in a competitive environment. We also know that diversity needs to be managed in order to achieve these results, that it provides greater performance and requires more time to achieve. Organizations must have mechanisms to resolve the inevitable conflicts. The results are worth it:

- lower absenteeism, lower turnover rates and higher job satisfaction
- enhanced reputation with potential customers
- greater productivity through better problem-solving capabilities.

Canada, as with many developed and some developing countries around the globe, finds itself in a new world of emerging technologies, converging international markets and trading arrangements. Industrialised countries have experienced a considerable shift from dependence on natural resources and manufactured goods to a knowledge-based economy. This has created a huge impact on the types of occupations in the Canadian labour market and on industrial structures.

Members of the four designated groups represent a strategic resource in an economy such as Canada's which is dependent on human capital. Women, people with disabilities and racial minorities constitute more than half of the workforce in many communities. Highly skilled immigrants are key in supporting the development of the knowledge-based economy and are an important source for addressing skills shortages. In the labour intensive service industries, a diverse workforce can make a business more competitive. As one example in the federal sphere - banks can serve a multi-ethnic and multi-lingual clientele if they have diverse personnel. This contributes directly to the bank's bottom line.

In an increasingly knowledge-based economy, failure to value the knowledge and skills of part of the population will result in giving up rare human resources to other nations. This link between a diverse workforce and a successful economy was recognized recently at the 2000 Davos World Economic Forum, where discussions on "Capitalising on Diversity" stressed that:

> "In the past, workforces were homogeneous by legal or customary exclusion or due to physical isolation. Now, not only ideas but workers and their families are spreading around the world, changing the assumptions of societies and cultures that receive and welcome them."

In the current context of economic globalization, and in the face of increasing international competition, employers cannot be blind to the cost of ignoring the skills and talents of all Canadians.

The link between the economic bottom line, competitiveness and employment equity has been underscored by the federal government - and I will quote briefly from the positive measures programme:

> "In a society that prides itself as a mosaic, diversity must give Canadian institutions a universal competitive edge in the global market. Diversity is an advantage only when it is valued and nurtured, not when it is merely accommodated. The legislative obligation under the Employment Equity Act is the foundation on which to build diversity. In turn, inclusiveness is what turns diversity into advantage."

In the private sector we have seen this shift of turning diversity into an advantage. The business case for diversity has moved from being seen as a human resources program or policy to being seen as a business imperative - a strategy for opening doors to new markets, providing better customer networking and support and, of course, maximizing the talent and capacity for innovation within the organization. Studies have shown that immigration and cultural diversity therefore not only enrich a country's cultural capital, and its social capital, it can enrich its GDP. Equality is increasingly no longer viewed as an issue of distribution of wealth but also of production of wealth.

VI) Multiculturalism in an Age of Globalization

Although we in Canada didn't realize it when the policy was first introduced over 30 years ago, multiculturalism may be the best model of governance for our current era of globalization.

With globalization, ideas, goods, technologies and people are moving across borders at an unprecedented pace. As borders become more porous, allegiances and identities become more diffuse and more diverse. Canadians might see themselves as Canadian citizens, but they may also define themselves as members of an ethnic community with ties to their former home, as members of a wider linguistic or religious community, of a business or professional group or a political movement. All of these allegiances cut across borders, and across class and social lines. Just to give you an idea of the scope, the 1996 Canadian census figures show that there were 16 languages other than English or French spoken by more than 100,000 people in Canada. Language is one aspect - understanding another culture, business priorities and networks of contacts is related.

It has been said that the phenomenon of globalization is qualitatively different from the national and international orders it is replacing. In large part, this is because it tracks closely the evolution of technology and therefore shares many of technology's fundamental characteristics - it transcends rigid structures, hierarchies and borders; it uses networks and strategic alliances and it integrates activities across both time and space. The new globalized world has been described as a "multicentric" world - ideas, power, alliances and movements can arise from any sector, any country or any actor. Since multiculturalism places a high value on the collectivities and allegiances of its citizens, it fits very naturally into this new world.

This idea that individuals have multiple identities, multiple allegiances and multiple communities to which they belong can therefore make governance very, very complicated. In some countries, split allegiances have led to exclusion rather than social cohesion and throughout the 1990s, in countries such as former Yugoslavia, Rwanda or Sierra Leone, the world saw an explosion of internal, inter-ethnic wars. Prime Minister Chretien, in an address this week in New York, spoke of Canada's approach to multiculturalism as a key policy response to the issues that can foster extremism and violence:

> As a country founded on diversity, Canada has adopted policies of inclusiveness. We are intimately aware of the challenges associated with facilitating dialogue between different groups - and we have learned that differences do not have to be divisive. Canada has much to share with respect to its rich and peaceful heritage of multiculturalism."

The message is that plural identities need not be a source of conflict. In fact, we have seen in Canada how diversity can be a source of social cohesion and stability. In spite of the claims of its early critics, studies have shown that "whether we look at naturalization, political participation, official language competence or intermarriage rates, there is no evidence to support the claim that 'multiculturalism has decreased the rate of integration of immigrants or increased the separation or natural hostility of ethnic groups" Let me conclude with a few words about multiculturalism and social

cohesion.

VII) Social Cohesion and multiculturalism

I think it is fair to say that since multiculturalism was introduced in the early seventies, the policy has been the object of much debate and, over time, has taken on a symbolic character. It has come to mean different things to different people. In fact what is often ignored is that "public recognition and affirmation of immigrants' ethnic identity is ... done within common institutions". Multiculturalism encourages integration of new ethnic identities into existing institutions. It encourages modification of institutions to make them more welcoming. And it recognizes that a failure to adopt such an approach creates risks of marginalization.

In some ways, the debate is a false polemic – posing an "either"/"or" choice between conformity of all citizens to the dominant culture and values on the one hand, and social fragmentation on the other. As Joseph Heath, a Montréal professor of Ethics and Political Economy has said:

> "the ambition of the multiculturalism policy has always been to ... suggest that one can integrate into the society "to respect the core principles underlying its institutions" – without necessarily coming to share all of its particular values endorsed by members of the majority culture. Just as one can become a good citizen of a country without adopting all of the religious convictions of the majority, one can also become a good citizen without accepting all the values of the majority. As long as one is prepared to play by the rules, and to respect the principles underlying the basic liberal institutional structure, then one has satisfied the requirements of citizenship. Thus the goal of the multiculturalism policy has been to make possible 'integration without assimilation'."

From this perspective, social cohesion does not require shared values, but does demand shared principles – a kind of social contract among citizens to, as Heath says, "play by the rules" and respect social institutions. When the Policy Research Network asked Canadians across the country last year "who they were and what they believed in", those who participated in the study identified a number of core principles at the heart of a pan-Canadian community. They were: a sense of shared community, equality and justice, respect for diversity, mutual responsibility, accountability and democracy.

I think it is also fair to say, therefore, that multiculturalism, rather than provoking a crisis of social integration in Canada, is helping promote it. Although it may sound counterintuitive, acceptance of, and support for diversity can be reflective of social cohesion. In a socially cohesive society, both the individual and society recognize the value of building a sense of acceptance and belonging among people based on trust, shared principles and common experiences that bridge, and accommodate, social, cultural, linguistic and religious differences.

This sense of shared principles was confirmed in a 2002 survey undertaken to assess public opinion on multiculturalism. The survey showed that, for Canadians, multiculturalism resonates positively throughout the country, and across regions, languages, gender, age and political preference. When Canadians were asked whether the preservation and enhancement of a multicultural heritage was an objective that the government should support, 82% agreed, with fully 86% of Quebeckers in agreement. When asked whether multiculturalism promotes the sharing of common values, 77% of Canadians agreed, and 80% thought that it also enhanced the value of Canadian citizenship. When asked the opposite question – whether the preservation and enhancement of the multicultural heritage of Canadians was a threat to social unity and solidarity - only 32% agreed. On issues of diversity, Canadians see multiculturalism as a most valuable means of ensuring respect and addressing racism. Over 80% felt that multiculturalism is helpful in ensuring that institutions in Canada reflect and respect cultural and racial diversity and 73% thought it helped solve problems of racism and racial prejudice. Finally, 71% saw multiculturalism as removing barriers to full and equal participation in Canadian society.

Drawing from the survey results, rather than creating divisions amongst different racial and ethnic groups, a policy of multiculturalism and respect for difference can actually lead to greater social cohesion.

VIII) Conclusion

If I can draw these three strands together – the public sector, the private sector and the general population – we can perhaps conclude that the Canadian experiment in multiculturalism is working. It isn't perfect yet and, given human nature, never could be. I think my point is best illustrated by one of my favourite authors, Roch Carrier.

Mr. Carrier wrote a famous children's book, the Hockey Sweater, which is about the deepest and most enduring rift in Canadian society - I am speaking here about the gap between fans of the Montreal Canadiens hockey team and fans of the Toronto Maple Leafs team. In a speech earlier this year on multiculturalism, Mr. Carrier told us about his family which arrived from France in 1760 but today includes members from Peru, Scotland, Korea and China. His family is not unlike my own and that of many, many other Canadians. In his speech, Mr. Carrier said:

> "Canada believes that diversity is not a problem, it's a principle of the richness of nature. Supposing some manager had been in charge of creating the world, perhaps he would decide there could only be two types of bird, one that flies and one that doesn't, or two types of flowers, black and white. But nature has a law, and this law is diversity. If it works for nature, we believe it will work for Canada."

Thank You.

Last Updated: 2004-07-06